

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1 through 9 are pending in the application.

The Drawings are objected to in that the reference numeral '45' in Fig. 1 is not mentioned in the Specification. Fig. 1 will be corrected to delete this reference numeral and associated lead line and ~ symbol, as shown in red on the enclosed print.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Rajaram.

Nelson discloses a metal halide lamp with an arc tube surrounded by a protective quartz sleeve.

Rajaram discloses a doped silica glass, suitable for use as an arc tube, the glass doped with an extremely small amount (10 - 1000 parts per million) of a trivalent element selected from a group of 30 such elements, and mixtures thereof. One of the group of 30 is Nd.

Rajaram does not mention any protective sleeve for an arc tube. However, the Examiner cites col. 6, lines 15-19, wherein it is stated that the glass composition is suitable for any application in which sodium diffusion or electrical resistivity is a problem, such as lamp envelopes, and semiconductor tubing or crucibles.

However, even if the skilled artisan were to combine the teachings of the references so as to dope the quartz sleeve with a trivalent dopant, there is no teaching or suggestion that Nd should be used exclusively. Nevertheless, assuming that Nd were selected as the dopant, it would not result in a Nd sleeve, but rather a doped quartz sleeve. All of Applicant's claims are limited to an arc lamp having a protective sleeve of Nd.

Such a lamp with an Nd sleeve was compared with a prior art lamp having a doped quartz sleeve (Lamp 2, page 7, line 1 of the Specification) and the lamp of the invention, with the Nd sleeve, was found to have a reduction (filtering) of the Na or yellow transmission and an increase in the red contribution for the visible spectrum. This provides a more incandescent-like, "warm" appearance with excellent red saturation. See page 6, lines 1-6 of Applicant's Specification.

This comparative test data clearly establishes that a doped quartz sleeve is not functionally equivalent to, and in fact, is inferior to, an Nd sleeve.

Accordingly, claims 1-9 are not obvious in view of the combination of Nelson in view of Rajaram, and the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John C. Fox". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975

Consulting Patent Attorney

203-329-6584